REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 22, 2003, claims 8, 10-12 are amended; as a result, claims <u>1-20</u> are now pending in this application.

Claims 8, 10-12 are amended only to correct their dependency from 6 to claim 7. The amendments are believed to be non-narrowing.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

1.   Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,973, "Kessler") in view of Passint et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,705, "Passint"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. To establish proper *prima facie* obviousness all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 13:

Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions of the proposed combination of Kessler and Passint, among other things, a plurality of objects in a processor, … wherein each packet also includes an LQID value corresponding to an LQID of one of the objects, and routing the first packet to the first object based on the LQID value in the first packet, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action indicated that the opcode from Passint is interpreted as a form of LQID. (*See* Office Action ¶ 3A.) However, in Passint, the opcode is decoded to indicate an action and is not used to route a packet to an object within a processor. (*See* Passint, Abstract and column 6 lines 26-30.) Applicant respectfully submits that the LQID is distinguishable from the opcode in Passint.

Applicant further believes that claims 7 and 13 are also allowable at least for the reason that the LQID is distinguishable from the opcode in Passint. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 7 and 13.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 15:

Claims 2 and 3 ultimately depend on base claim 1, claims 8 and 9 ultimately depend on base claim 7, and claims 14 and 15 ultimately depend on base claim 13. Applicant believes that claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 15 are allowable at least for the reasons stated above for their base claims, namely 1, 7 and 13.

Also, Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions of Kessler and Passint, among other things, a teaching or suggestion of routing a plurality of packets, each having a different LQID, to a first object based on the LQID value in each respective packet, as recited in the contested claims. As stated previously, Applicant believes the LQID is distinguishable from the opcode in Passint.

Further, it is not clear to the Applicant how the proposed combination of Kessler with Passint results in an addressing scheme that is customizable (as stated in the Office Action ¶ 3B), in a manner that reads on the routing recited in the contested claims. Instead, Passint discloses only sending a message from one processor to another. (*See* Passint, column 2 lines 45-49.)

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14 and 15.

Regarding claims 5, 11 and 17:

Claim 5 depends on base claim 1, claim 11 depends on base claim 7 and claim 17 depends on base claim 13. Applicant believes claims 5, 11, and 17 are allowable at least for the reasons stated previously for the base claims.

Also, Applicant is unable to find in cited portions of Kessler with Passint a teaching or suggestion of a first LQID associated with a first object to be used for point-to-point data traffic, and a second LQID associated with the first object to be used for shortcut data traffic, as recited in the contested claims.

Further, the prior art does not teach, suggest, or provide an incentive for the modification of the prior art to provide the claimed invention. The Office Action states the motivation is defining the desired opcode convention that would enable the different messaging facilities. However, Applicant is unable to find this motivation (i.e. a teaching, suggestion, or incentive) in the proposed combination of Kessler with Passint, and the motivation to modify cannot come from the Applicant's patent application. Also, as discussed previously, Applicant believes defining an opcode convention does not read on establishing first and second LQIDs to route data traffic.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 11 and 17.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 09/661636
Filing Date: September 13, 2000
Title: PACKET ROUTING SYSTEM AND METHOD

Page 8
Dkt: 1384.002US1

2.   Claims 4, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,973) in view of Passint et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,705) and in further view of Stracke (6,047,330). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 4 depends on base claim 1, claim 10 depends on base claim 7 and claim 16 depends on base claim 13. Applicant believes claims 4, 10 and 16 are allowable at least for the reasons stated previously for the base claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 4, 10 and 16.

3.   Claims 6, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,973) in view of Passint et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,705) and in further view of Allen et al. (4,667,287, "Allen"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 6 depends on base claim 1, claim 12 depends on base claim 7 and claim 18 depends on base claim 13. Applicant believes claims 6, 12 and 18 are allowable at least for the reasons stated previously for the base claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 6, 12 and 18.

4.   Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,973) in view of Passint et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,705) and in further view of Kaputska et al. (Kaputska, K. et al., "Cosine Communication moves VPNs 'Into the Cloud' with Leading Managed IP Service Delivery Platform," Cosine Communications, http://www/cosinecom/news/pr_5_24.html, 5p., May24, 1999)(hereinafter "Kaputska"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 19 and 20 depend on claim 13 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons stated previously for claim 13. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 19 and 20.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 09/661636
Filing Date: September 13, 2000
Title: PACKET ROUTING SYSTEM AND METHOD

Page 9
Dkt: 1384.002US1

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6909) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

ABRAHAM MATTHEWS ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6909

Date _March 18, 2004_ By _Thomas F. Brennan_

Thomas F. Brennan
Reg. No. 35,075